

Date: Thu, 7 Jan 93 18:36:18 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #35  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Thu, 7 Jan 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    35

Today's Topics:

                    430mhz band under th  
430 mhz band under th (now private/closed repeaters)  
430 mhz band under th (now repeater costs) (2 msgs)  
                    Alinco DJ-F1T questions  
                    Anybody want to talk about Clover?  
                    County Hunter reports  
                    Morality vs. THE LAW (2 msgs)  
                    Private Repeaters  
                    Re: 430MHz band under threat!  
                    RTTY contest software

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Thu, 07 Jan 1993 16:32:35 EST  
From: uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!clemon@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 430mhz band under th  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <kPJqwB2w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca>, emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca writes:

> And how are you going to do that? If you're both on simplex on the  
> repeater input frequency, it's very likely that you will never hear most  
> of the people you are interfering with. A repeater receiver on a 3,000 ft  
> hilltop is going to hear a lot better than a mobile receiver running  
> along the road below it at 200 ft elevation. It will hear a handheld  
> at fifty miles, in all probability, while you guys in your mobiles may

> get twenty or thirty miles or less.

Hey, guess what, if the repeater owner is OUTRIGHT AND UTTERY STUPID enough to put a mountaintop repeater on a nationally accepted simplex frequency (and not even putting on PL access) he had better expect interference (ie. people not knowing it's a repeater input) at times. We are NOT psychic. How are we supposed to know we're accessing a repeater? Kerchunk endlessly while listening on every possible output frequency in turn to see if we hear ourselves? I think not. If no one has the decency to tell anyone (via Directory's, even though they aren't mandatory) about the odd split, there's no reason why ham's should be *\*afraid\** to transmit on a simplex frequency while on a trip and using standard simplex frequencies just in case we are accessing someone's PRIVATE mountaintop repeater on his PRIVATE frequency that he feels no one else should have the gall to use. Get Real!

> > Now I'm not saying that I wouldn't change frequencies if asked politely,  
> > but that often is not the case when you read about all the nasty  
> > comments tossed at those "infringers" on a particular frequency.

> There's no excuse for not knowing what part of the band in your area is  
> used for repeater inputs, and as far as I'm concerned, operating simplex  
> on a repeater input is nothing short of MALICIOUS INTERFERENCE. While you  
> may not be concerned about the possibility, there is every likelihood  
> that sooner or later you will interfere with someone trying to access a  
> repeater to report a traffic accident or call an ambulance.

Right, I'll sell my radio now, just in case. If you read his post, you would have seen that he was using standard simplex freqs. and probably low power as they would have been close to each other. He *\*DOES\** know the band (national standard simplex). There's no excuse for being so irresponsible to put a mountaintop repeater on simplex frequencies, not publish the freq to state this conflict, which, after all, you state could affect a life or death situation. If the band is full, why don't you follow the advice of many of the other private repeater operators (who already have what they wanted) : Why not go up to 902, 1240, hell even 2400. There's LOTS of space up there. You'll probably say you don't want to for the same reason all of the other open-repeater supporters have.

> There are always simplex frequencies on every band if you want to operate  
> simplex, just as there are sections set aside for packet, for voice, for  
> cw, etc. Many of the "rules" governing amateur behaviour are not written  
> in national rules and regs, but are practices that have arisen over the  
> years from general agreement and common sense.

Yes, and he was on them.

> If you don't like the way repeater spectrum is allocated, get on the

> coordinating committee, or VUAC. Please don't advocate the anarchy of  
> everyone operating wherever he/she pleases without regard for the rest of  
> us.

Hmmm. Maybe I'll join a co-ordinating committee across the country  
just in case I travel there. Thanks for the tip.

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297  
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon@lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering  
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo  
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

-----  
Date: Thu, 07 Jan 1993 16:02:21 EST  
From: uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!clemon@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 430 mhz band under th (now private/closed repeaters)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C06ys7.5po@iat.holonet.net>, Bob Wilkins n6fri writes:

> phr@telebit.com (Paul Rubin) writes:  
> There is no spectrum shortage. Packet has not even began to use the  
> frequencies that local coordinators and the arrl spectrum usage committees  
> have recommended for packet and digital usage. Look at 902 and 1240 there  
> is plenty of spectrum.  
>  
> Your wanting to put up an experimental packet repeater in a crowded  
> spectrum is interesting. Why not try spread spectrum on 902 . Prove it  
> works and the ham community will beat a path to your door. You say no one  
> is on 902 ..ok link it down to a 2meters packet gateway ..show them that  
> there is something there. The local dx packet spotting network ran out of  
> spectrum on 2meters and found that 1240 works just fine. The users can  
> talk on 2meters without bothering their packet connection on 1240 as was  
> the case when they connected on 2meters.  
>  
> If the amateur community does not use the vast amount of spectrum on the  
> upper bands , we may find that the commercial services can and will  
> petition the commission for spectrum releif. You dont want to use 1240, ok  
> there are several well funded commercial services that would love to set  
> up a mobile sattellite service and rake in the bucks. They have no  
> spectrum for that now.

This whole argument (I don't mean discussion, I mean the  
previoiusly mentioned point). I followup seen later says "Why should I buy  
new transceivers because all the other pairs are tied up with inactive  
machines". I agree with that too. I agree that there is a place for

closed systems. "private" systems..well.. they seem s little stuck up to me. But that's another story. The problem I have is when closed/open ratios get too large. When I look through the repeater directory's California section I get sick to my stomach. This is REDICULOUS! There is NO spectrum left for a well-meaning ham who wants to set up and OPEN machine for people to USE. 1240 and 902 might have lots of bandspace but they have few USERS, the people that make the repeater work. If I were to set up a repeater, it would be open (at least after standard repeater functions were debugged ie. courtesy tone, timeouts etc...). I am planning to start up a privately \_owned\_, homebrew repeater (commercial radios, homebrew controller). I have no money now (UNiversity student) but I'm watching for older equipment I can afford. When I set this up, I will be trying to get the best site, the best radios, the highest sensitivity etc..etc... FOR ALL THE HAMS IN THE AREA. This includes 144/440 bands (with optional link) and possibly 6 and 220 sometime. This would be a system setup to "kick butt" shall we say and to provide a solid, full-featured repeater that someone actually cares about (unlike some of the local club-owned repeaters) to ensure that it stays operational. If I were in California (thank God I'm not) the closed/open ratio and the sheer number of repeater would prevent me from doing this service to ALL Hams.

In summary, my biggest beef is the TERRIBLE closed/open ratio I've seen. If the ratio weren't so bad, I wouldn't have such a problem with it.

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297  
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon%lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering  
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo  
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

-----  
Date: Thu, 07 Jan 1993 16:18:01 EST  
From: uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!clemon@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 430 mhz band under th (now repeater costs)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C05L02.15s@iat.holonet.net>, Bob Wilkins n6fri writes:

> You know that many nets operate on 20 40 75 meters, they are essentially  
> closed nets for the most part. Only open to the partisipants. It is rare  
> that anyone jumps up and down about that.  
>  
> --  
> Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area  
> bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ w6pw.#nocal.ca.us  
>

These nets go away after they're done. Net Control doesn't sit around after the net is adjourned and say "Hey! Get off of here, we talk here on a net sometimes! You're not my friend so you can't talk here anyways!". I know that friendship isn't always the case for closed repeaters but it often is.

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297  
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon%lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering  
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo  
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

-----  
Date: Thu, 07 Jan 1993 16:14:16 EST  
From: uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!clemon@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 430 mhz band under th (now repeater costs)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <RuTNwB5w165w@stat.com>, David Dode11 writes:

> How do you judge the \* most effective use \* ??? I think this can become  
> subjective. Some of the "closed" machines that I use are busier then the  
    ^^^^  
> open machines. Some of the open UHF machines in Phoenix have no user  
    ^^^^  
> base, and sit idle for hours at a time. The closed machines usually are  
> busier. So I guess the open machines should shut down to make more room  
> for the closed machines?

Yes... SOME. How about addressing MOST and the majority of?

> I think each have their place. Some of the closed machines I use could  
> not operate effectively if everyone and his brother had the control  
> codes. The remote base features would become totally useless.

There's a large difference involved here. Giving out control codes and allowing someone to talk are two totally different things.

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297  
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon%lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering  
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo  
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

-----  
Date: 7 Jan 93 23:26:15 GMT

From: naucse!navvax.ucc.nau.edu!cvm@arizona.edu  
Subject: Alinco DJ-F1T questions  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

There isn't a ham store nearby so maybe someone can answer two questions I have about the Alinco DJ-F1T.

First, is this radio modifiable for out of band transmit? If so, what frequency ranges. Please no flames/comments about type acceptance.

Second, how does the radio handle odd offset repeaters? Do all/some of the memory channels allow odd offsets?

-----  
Chris Michels -- Systems Programmer                      cvm@navvax.ucc.nau.edu  
Northern Arizona University -- Flagstaff, AZ            cvm@navvax.bitnet  
Phone: (602) 523-6495                                      N7YIU

-----  
Date: Fri, 08 Jan 1993 00:21:54 GMT  
From: news.mentorg.com!hanko!hanko@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Anybody want to talk about Clover?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1iidqgINNet9@darkstar.UCSC.EDU>, haynes@cats.ucsc.edu (Jim Haynes) writes:

<CLOVER discussion goes here or .packet?>

Sounds interesting.  
Working on CLOVER interface with my BBS code.  
Will be on 14.084 or 21.084 for initial testing ...

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics  
Internet : hank\_oredson@mentorg.com  
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NA

-----  
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1993 23:42:47 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewse!k9un@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: County Hunter reports  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I had several experiences with county hunters about 10 years ago.

I spend a lot of my time camping - sometimes in very remote places. While on my way to and from these place, I often went through some very rare counties and used to enjoy being at the "dx" end of a pile-up. Eventually, I had some very frustrating experiences where the net control station wanted me to - in effect - guess what the report was that was being sent to me. I could tell that there was a station on the freq, but nothing he said was intelligible! After many frustrating tries, I finally declared no contact. The net control station got really upset with me that I wouldn't play by their rules - which were if you guessed right, it was a good 2-way qso!!! I don't even want a rare DX card under those conditions. What is the purpose? As I said this was about 10 years ago, and I hope it was an isolated instance, but judging from some of the DX "qso's" I've heard on the bands, I doubt it.

Wes Ague - k9un

-----  
Date: Fri, 8 Jan 1993 02:11:28 GMT  
From: tcsi.com!iat.holonet.net!bwilkins@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Morality vs. THE LAW  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

feg@cbnewsb.cb.att.com (forrest.e.gehrke) writes:  
: In article <1993Jan07.183938.8340@eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris - WA3UQV) writes:

: Have you a more discreet appellation to suggest which conveys  
: the same measure of disdain? (;-)  
:  
: Forrest Gehrke feg@dodger.att.com k2bt  
:

While only monitoring.... several private repeaters , I have heard the word analpore in common usage.

--  
Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area  
bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ w6pw.#nocal.ca.usa.na

-----  
Date: Fri, 8 Jan 1993 02:12:53 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ukma!miles@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Morality vs. THE LAW  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

feg@cbnewsb.cb.att.com (forrest.e.gehrke) writes:

>In article <1993Jan07.183938.8340@eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris - WA3UQV) writes:

>>We would much rather that these closed "vanity" repeaters be on shared  
>>frequency pairs, so as to free up space for other more effective public uses.

>>

>>>there are ASSHOLES. I personally would like to be remembered as a nice

>>

>>Remember! Nice people don't call other people "assholes".

>>

>Have you a more discreet appellation to suggest which conveys

>the same measure of disdain? (;-)

Nothing quite as satisfying. ;)

>Forrest Gehrke feg@dodger.att.com k2bt

>>

>>Chuck Harris - WA3UQV

-----  
Date: 8 Jan 93 00:15:15 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Private Repeaters  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Forgetting about who did what to who for a minute, think about this:

I am a somewhat active ham although I tend to go through phases of greater and less interest. I use repeaters on occasion but I am not an every-day repeater personality. Therefore I do not have a high-powered, expensive vhf or uhf rig in my car.

I generally carry my Tempo HT (1.5 watts on 2M) or my Tempo mobile rig (10 w on 2M). The HT has PL, but it is an old board which is xtal controlled on one subtone. The mobile needs to be opened up to change the tone.

This is modest equipment, but I do think that it ought to serve for occasional use, especially in emergencies. RF and audio-wise it does work fine.

But when you've got 5 repeaters within range and 4 of them are closed it doesn't make me feel very good, OR very safe...



I think it's to all our benefit to have as many open repeaters as possible. To this end I suggest two things:

1 - Open repeaters should be coordinated ahead of closed repeaters, unless there are more open machines than closed ones.

2 - Simplex frequencies should NOT be used for repeaters. They should be left for simplex use.

---

-----

\\/ ^ ^	Ben Mehlman KB2ERP Trirex Systems Inc	Indigo..
# # @	bmehlman@trirex.com	Indigoing..
\\___/	>NeXTMail Welcome<	Indigone.

-----

-----

Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1993 19:51:54 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hp1extra!hp1-opus!hpnmdla!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Re: 430MHz band under threat!  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:

>In article <14570574@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

>>Let's see, \$15/month is \$180/year per user. Even if you only had 10 users, >>you be getting \$1800/year. At that rate, you could buy a decent repeater >>out of one year's receipts. Unless you are paying really exorbitant site >>rental fees, there's no way it should cost \$15/month per user.

>The group I belong to is part of a large inter-city linked radio system. >The Houston group supports six sites. That's six repeaters and thirteen >full-duplex link radios. This includes all antennas, radios, duplexors, >power, insurance, etc. Our budget easily exceeds \$1500 per year.

>Our group dues are \$120 per year. As of last year, there was a \$90 surplus >in the bank account. I'm not getting rich on this, folks...just paying the >bills.

At that rate, you only need 13 members to break even. Are your 13 members really holding 19 frequency sanctions?

I guess that's my main beef with closed repeaters. Our frequencies are a valuable commodity. On HF, usage level is self-regulating: If an under-utilized channel develops, someone will immediately find it and use it. But on the repeater bands, a repeater or control link effectively "owns" the frequency, as a practical matter.

I believe only open repeaters should get clear channels. The closed machines should have to share channels with each other, using P/L or some other method to avoid interference. I realize this is being done to some extent, but there are far too many under-utilized frequencies with only one or two closed machines assigned.

AL N1AL

-----  
Date: 7 Jan 93 21:35:34 GMT  
From: spool.mu.edu!olivea!isc-br!tau-ceti!comtch!iea!FredGate@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: RTTY contest software  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

JG> From: ag821@yfn.ysu.edu (Jeff Gold)  
JG> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc

JG> Does anyone know of a decent contest RTTY program available on  
JG> a FTP site?

Well that's not enough information. I know of lots of RTTY programs, what computer system Jeff? If its a PK232 I would suggest sending Hal, WA7EGA, a blank disk and mailer. His Scotchlg works quite well, not elegant, but it works for all RTTY contests and others. It also works with a KAM and might work with the HAL PCI-3000.

There are many commercial programs. Perhaps the "leading" is WF1B's that does work on many TNC's. Most programs the "claim" to log don't work for sour grapes in a contest.

JG> I used Lan-Link in the last contest, it somehow lost my first days

Whew, to not print as you log is to risk all....

JG> 73s de Cookeville, TN  
JG> Jeff, AC4HF

Yep 73, Jay WS7I

\* Origin: Think Tank II BBS \* Spokane, WA (509) 244-6446 (1:346/8)

-----  
Date: Thu, 07 Jan 1993 17:08:11 EST  
From: uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!clemon@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <8228@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<1993Jan02.200308.16355@eng.umd.edu>e  
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan04.035912.16697@ssc.com>, Tad Cook writes:

> >No one expects to use your autopatch for free; so control your access codes.  
> >If you find that someone spends a great deal of time on your machine, remind  
> >that person that it costs a lot of money to run a repeater, and you can use  
> >all the help you can get, but don't expect to be able to force that individual  
> >to pay. This is not a commercial venture. If you still can't deal with your  
> >"great act of charity", then take your repeater down, and let someone else use  
> >the allocation. There are plenty of hams out there who would love to put up an  
> >open repeater on your pair!  
> >  
>  
> If the closed repeater annoys you so much, then go use an open one.  
>

One of the points of this entire discussion, though, is that fact that, relatively speaking, THERE AREN'T ANY! I paraphrase from ealier (not myself) "If you haven't been \_INVITED\_ to use any UHF systems, don't bother buying a radio [as there is nothing/little else].".

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297  
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon%lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering  
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo  
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

-----  
Date: 8 Jan 1993 01:47:52 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan4.144520.19597@ulfb.isc.rit.edu>,  
<1993Jan6.093218.27598@qualcomm.com>, <1ihk85INNeh8@tamsun.tamu.edu>  
Subject : Re: Who do repeater coordinators represent?

That's all well and good theory, Phil, but who is going to build it?

BTW, when are you going to put your antennas up? You've been living there at least half a year and you don't have ANY of them installed yet.  
- Brian

-----  
Date: Thu, 07 Jan 1993 16:53:24 EST  
From: uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!clemon@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <8228@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<1993Jan02.200308.16355@eng.umd.edu>c  
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <C0A7J9.7tL@NeoSoft.com>, Jim Reese writes:

> Think of it in these terms... The public highway system is available to  
> anyone who has a drivers license. If you choose to ride the city bus, you  
> can do this for 75 cents and get to your destination. If I choose to buy  
> a Porsche, I spend \$30,000 and get to my destination. We are both using the  
> same public road.  
>  
> Does your right to drive on a public road give you the right to use my Porsche  
> anytime you want, for free, just because you have a drivers license? No it  
> doesn't.

I think the issue here is whether or not you, in your Porsche, have the right to force the bus to move out of the lane you want to drive in because you can go faster and your car cost more. The answer is \*NO\*. Also, the issue involves another facet. Say the government starts licensing only BUSES and Porsches. It seems that not too many people are buying buses and everyone is buying Porsches. Soon the government runs out of licenses and everyone has to use the roads with the Porsches and buses that \_already exist\_. The number of Porsches already vastly outnumbers the number of buses, if there are any buses at all. It seems that if you don't know a person with a Porsche that will invite you to ride with him, you can't get anywhere. What frustrates you most is that you see all these people that don't use their Porsches - perhaps they have 2 or 3, even 5, or don't even use the one they own, while you have no way to get around. You'd love to get a Porsche, or maybe even help everyone out and buy a bus, but there are no more liscenses and the government can't do a thing. Then, some yuppie in a Porsche tells you that you could walk alone on a little

dirt path through the mountains that heads away from the other people and the destination you wanted. He doesn't care because he has his Porsche, and no one wants to (or can) ride on a bus through the mountains. Visitors driving through the area in their VW's and Acuras are run off the road, because the Porsche owners want the road to themselves. Do you see the point yet?

> --

> Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans never refer to trouble  
> jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | as deep doo-doo" --Molly Ivins  
>

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297  
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon%lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering  
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo  
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #35

\*\*\*\*\*